

MR2349-741  
S.N. 10/002,104  
Amendment After Final dated 5 September 2003  
Reply to Office Action of 20 June 2003

### REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Final Office Action dated 20 June 2003. Responsive to the rejections made in that Final Office Action, Claims 6 and 9 have been canceled from this case, and Claims 3 and 7 are amended for further prosecution with the other pending Claims. It is believed that with such amendment of Claims, there is a further clarification of Applicant's invention for this Patent Application.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner disapproved the drawing changes earlier proposed by Applicant (to add reference numbers for more clearly identifying certain portions of the illustrated embodiment). The additional reference numbers were proposed simply to aid in clarifying the disclosure by specifically naming for ease of reference certain portions of the embodiment shown in the drawings. Nevertheless, in light of the Examiner's disapproval, the proposed changes are hereby withdrawn.

The Examiner objected to the disclosure for containing improper phraseology. The Abstract has now been amended to remove the objectionable phraseology, as well as to remove mention of the term "permeability," so as to preserve consistency with the Specification as now amended.

MR2349-741  
S.N. 10/002,104  
Amendment After Final dated 5 September 2003  
Reply to Office Action of 20 June 2003

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Applicant's earlier-filed Amendment under 35 U.S.C. § 132, as introducing new matter into the disclosure by incorporating therein mention of "magnetic permeability," "pair of electrical leads," "first terminal," and "second terminal." While it is believed that such amendment of the disclosure does not constitute new matter, the affected paragraphs of the disclosure are nonetheless amended to remove mention of the terms therefrom, in the interests of expediting prosecution of this case.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 7-9, 3, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chanteau, et al. reference in view of the Stover, et al. reference. In setting forth this rejection, the Examiner acknowledged that Chanteau, et al. fails to disclose a fusible winding. The Examiner, however, cited the Stover, et al. reference for this feature and concluded that one skilled in the art would have found it obvious to combine the teachings of these references to arrive at the claimed device.

The Examiner additionally rejected Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chanteau, et al. and Stover, et al. references, further in view of the Bailey reference. In setting forth this rejection, the Examiner acknowledged that Chanteau, et al. and Stover, et al. fail to disclose the use of multiple windings, but cited

the Bailey reference for the feature. The Examiner again concluded that one skilled in the art would have found it obvious to combine the teachings of these references to arrive at the claimed device.

Applicant's independent Claim 7 has now been amended, and Claim 9 canceled, to, in part, preserve consistency with the Specification as presently amended. That is, uses *per se* of the terms found objectionable by the Examiner have now been removed in the Claims. In the case of the terms "electrical leads" and "first and second terminals," which were incorporated for referential purposes to clarify the Claims' recitations (and avoid indefiniteness), references have been made instead to "lead portions" extending from the magnetic core and "first and second terminal portions" of the coil in order to maintain descriptive clarity.

In any event, newly-amended independent Claim 7 now more clearly recites a multipurpose input device having among its features "a magnetic coil," and "a coil having a predetermined electrical resistance" between certain "first and second terminal portions thereof." The Claim also recites among its features this "coil being constructed from a fusible material and helically disposed about said magnetic core," such that it "caus[es] an open circuit in said coil upon the flow of a predetermined electrical current therethrough," and does so "for limiting current flow to levels below said predetermined

MR2349-741  
S.N. 10/002,104  
Amendment After Final dated 5 September 2003  
Reply to Office Action of 20 June 2003

electrical current.” The Claim further recites among its features “a protective covering layer coated onto said coil.”

The full combination of these and other features now more clearly recited by Applicant’s pending Claims are nowhere disclosed by the cited references. Note, for instance, that while the primarily cited Chanteau, et al. reference discloses a self-inductance element having a coil winding, the reference nowhere discloses such coil winding to be “constructed from a fusible material,” as Claim 7 recites. Nor does the reference even suggest such construction which “caus[es] an open circuit in said coil upon the flow of a predetermined electrical current therethrough for limiting current flow to levels below said predetermined electrical current,” as Claim 7 also now more clearly recites. In fact, the reference teaches specifically to the contrary, prescribing instead a self-inductance element that enables the passage of “strong...currents” which are “of at least” a certain amperage (Column 1; lines 17 and 31). Far from suggesting a coil constructed of fusible material “for limiting current flow to levels below” a certain electrical current, the reference teaches instead a coil that will assuredly continue to pass current for levels at or above a certain level. The reference teaches altogether away from any fusible coil of the type recited by Applicant’s Claims.

Given such contrary teachings of the primarily cited Chanteau, et al. reference, the

MR2349-741  
S.N. 10/002,104  
Amendment After Final dated 5 September 2003  
Reply to Office Action of 20 June 2003


secondarily cited Stover, et al. and Bailey references are found to be quite ineffectual to the present patentability analysis. Note in this regard that the secondarily-cited Stover, et al. reference prescribes as an essential feature of its fuse device the immersion of its fuse link necessarily in a liquid. The central focus of this reference is to provide a fuse which guards against explosive arcing (when the link is broken) by providing a liquid about its fuse link such that when over-current conditions arise, film-boiling of the liquid occurs which, in turn, “results in rapid temperature rise and melting of the fuse link,” (Column 3; lines 25-26). The reference would hardly permit the exclusion of this central feature (of the liquid immersion), let alone its substitution with simply “a protective covering layer coated onto said coil,” that Claim 7 recites. Doing so would frustrate the very purpose of this reference.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the cited Chanteau, et al., Stover, et al., and Bailey references, even when considered together, fail to disclose the unique combination of elements now more clearly recited by Applicant’s pending Claims for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application.

MR2349-741  
S.N. 10/002,104  
Amendment After Final dated 5 September 2003  
Reply to Office Action of 20 June 2003

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application is in condition for allowance,  
and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jun Y. Lee  
Registration #40,262

9/5/2003

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive-Suite 101  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
(410) 465-6678

JYL/ds

RECEIVED  
SEP - 9 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800



04586

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE